DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 455 RC 013 198

AUTHOR Pascual, Henry W.
TITLE Clients and Teachers in Bilingual Education Programs.
INSTITUTION New Mexico State Dept. of Education, Santa Fe.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 21 Aug 78
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the National Conference on the Education of Hispanics (Alexandria, VA, August 21-23, 1978).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; *Bilingual Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Eligibility; Equal Education; Federal Programs; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; Language Proficiency; Mexican Americans; *Program Improvement; *Spanish Speaking; Student Evaluation; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Lau v Nichols

ABSTRACT

Whether bilingual education programs continue to be model projects for demonstrating viable alternatives for the education of Hispanics or general programs to correct deficits in the education of our children, the selection of students for participation in the programs and the training of teachers for these programs are serious responsibilities. Recommendations to the U.S. Office of Education for determining eligibility for bilingual programs suggest including: (1) Hispanic students, regardless of surname, who are on grade level or lower in standardized achievement tests in English language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics; (2) Hispanic students falling within categories outlined in the Lau Remedies; and (3) any Hispanic students wishing access to bilingual education, regardless of economic background or English proficiency. Bilingual teacher training programs should provide: demonstrable competence in understanding, speaking, reading, and writing the non-English language; study of the history, civilization, fine arts, and literature of the people whose culture is to be taught or learned; study of specific language pedagogy; teaching the academic content in Spanish; training in socio and psycholinguistic factors impinging upon the learning process; and training in teaching of English, both as a second and first language. (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212455

CLIENTS AND TEACHERS IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

BY

HENRY W. PASCUAL
DIRECTOR

Title VII Technical Assistance Unit
N.M. State Department of Education
Santa Fe, New Mexico

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Henry W. Pascual

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FEB 1982
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

Paper prepared for

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE EDUCATION OF HISPANICS

BLANK PAGE
DO NOT FILM

Sponsored by

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Hispanic Concerns
Alexandria, Virginia
August 21-23, 1978

RC 013198

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Clients and Teachers in Bilingual Education Programs
By Henry W. Pascual

Through the National Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and more specifically through the amendments to that act in 1968 and 1974, the Congress has declared it to be the policy of the United States to support, both financially and politically, the concept of bilingual education. This declaration of policy has placed the country in an educational leadership position, philosophically speaking, throughout the world. But philosophy was not what Congress had in mind when the first and subsequent appropriations were made for bilingual education. Their eyes were on the sparrow, as it were, when funds were made available to establish bilingual programs; and the sparrow was the student with limited English-speaking proficiency. Ten years after the National Bilingual Education Act was enacted, Congress is still concerned about the lack of English language proficiency of millions of children in the nation's schools.

From the original concerns which prompted the amendments of 1968 and 1974 to the present, the basic aim of the law has been to provide equal educational opportunity. Since most of the national involvement in education is of a compensatory, remedial, or promotive nature, it is not surprising that bilingual education was assigned these same categories. The concern for equality of opportunity in all levels of life for all Americans gave birth to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Supreme Court Decision in Lau vs. Nichols, although not primarily a case for bilingual education, further reaffirmed the nation's concern with equality of opportunity for those Americans who speak languages other than English.

Thus, federally financed bilingual education programs began to be implemented in earnest after the National Bilingual Education Act received signi-

ficant appropriations in 1968 and thereafter. The Lau vs. Nichols Decision in 1974 added a measure of strength to these programs in 1974, so that linguistic and cultural minorities in the nation are now convinced of the sincerity of the federal government in making bilingual education a significant factor in the total education of ethnic minorities.

The most marked effects that the concept of bilingualism in education is having in the country are two and with two groups: a) a large segment of the American public is asking, although sometimes indirectly, whether bilingualism will be harmful to our national unity; and b) the linguistic and cultural minorities are rediscovering their ethnic identitities mainly through national programs such as bilingual education. The first group comes mainly from the large English-speaking population which sees bilingualism as a suspect mark of un-Americanism and as detrimental to intellectual functioning. Understandably, the second group sees bilingualism not only as a broadening intellectual attribute, but also as a significant expression of cultures - two cultures - in which individuals find identity and fulfillment.

The challenge for Hispanics in the United States is to achieve a modification of the views of the monolingual English-speaking majority regarding other languages and cultures. This nation needs more enlightened perceptions of the issues; perceptions which will allow it to see that multilingualism in an individual, a group, or a nation is a mark of intellectual excellence; and that linguistic dexterity leads to appreciation, participation in, and enjoyment of various cultures. It is also our challenge to bring forth, not the conflicts and rivalries that tend to separate ethnic groups, but the means by which tensions, cultural myopia and intolerance are reduced. Bilingual education can be the vehicle through which this can be accomplished. In order to achieve this we must travel a difficult road paved with abstract im-

pediments, and because protean, these impediments place us always on the defensive; and we find ourselves apologizing for having linguistic and cultural endowments which others pay dearly to acquire.

Along with the issue of equal access, Hispanics see bilingual education as a reaffirmation of American democratic ideals and as an avenue for self-actualization. We also know that the ethos of the nation is essentially multicultural and that in spite of the ethnocentrism of a small minority, the vast generosity, patience, and liberalism of the nation at large will guide us toward a policy and a reality that will view bilingualism and multiculturalism as national human resources.

Our perspectives or the facts not withstanding, we must address the issues in consonance with the law and the law is rather specific. For instance the law reads as follows:

> "Sec. 702(a) Recognizing -
> "(1) that there are large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability... The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States, in order to establish equal educational opportunity..."

Therefore we find the two basic elements with which we must directly concern ourselves - equal educational opportunity and limited English-speaking ability.

If the Lau vs. Nichols Decision is a significant expression of the right to equal educational opportunity, it is significant in that it acknowledges that lack of linguistic proficiency in a medium of instruction forecloses equality of access to the learning process. We must understand that language proficiency is a term that covers a wide range of skills and that proficiency, like skills, atrophies with neglect creating a spiraling effect which causes intellectual arrest and linguistic encapsulation into a narrow band of performance. This encapsulation is the result of neglect, abuse, and the denigration of the language and its users. In the Lau Decision, language as the

all tenth graders in the state. The results of the study revealed that 91 percent of the "Anglo" students scored at or above the 65 percent proficiency guideline, but only 67 percent of the Hispanic students scored at that level. Nearly ten years earlier, in 1969, a similar study on the achievement of the various ethnic groups in the state was also conducted. The results were the same, the Anglo American students outdistanced Hispanics in achievement. These studies, of course, do not include the dropouts. Lack of holding power by the schools is an important factor when addressing the equal opportunity issue. As the Commission on Civil Rights reports in "The Unfinished Education," "Mexican-Americans have the highest estimated rate of attrition.... At the time of high school graduation, only 60 percent of Chicanos are still in school."[2] The loss of nearly half of the student population speaks not only of educational neglect but of deeper and more significant causes. Many researchers, psychologists, and educators believe that linguistic and cultural dichotomy are largely responsible for the social malaise which Hispanics undergo in public schools. And it must be pointed out here that if bilingual education has made its mark, it has done so in the area of eliminating the feeling of ambivalence or of anomie which has traditionally characterized school life for them. Those of us who are observing the evolution of bilingual education can see how the equal opportunity issue is being addressed. It takes sustained and perceptive observation over a long period of time to recognize the intrinsic value of educational approaches of this nature; because the effects are, in the beginning, very tenuous. The reason for this being that when dealing with language and the deeper substance of content - culture - one is working with intellectual dimensions the breadth and depth of which are so vast and significant that it is difficult to discern marks or indications of pro-

basic tool for conceptual development assumes its proper importance. Language researchers have always known the important role of language in intellectual functioning. As Vygotsky so clearly points out, "...in the evolution of language the very structure of meaning and its psychological nature also change. From primitive generalizations, verbal thought rises to the most abstract concepts. It is not merely the content of a word that changes, but the way in which reality is generalized and reflected in a word."[1] Indeed, without the medium there is no message, but of greater portent is the fact that once the symbolic universe of knowing is codified in one language, as it most certainly is by the time a child reaches school age, reality is generalized and reflected in the word. But the word, in terms of full command of English, is usually lacking for many Hispanics in our schools. Without the needed proficiency in the language, the learner has disadvantages the magnitude of which we may be powerless to measure. We shall return to the question of proficiency later.

The spiraling effect of the lack of proficiency in the official language of school has been recorded by numerous researchers. One need only peruse the four reports of the Civil Rights Commission on the education of Mexican-Americans to recognize the magnitude of the problem.

The various states with Hispanic populations have statistics which record the traditional lack of achievement of Hispanics in the public schools. In New Mexico, as recently as the fall of 1977, Mexican-Americans continued to score well below Anglo-American students in general school achievement. In April, 1977, the New Mexico State Board of Education approved a basic skills plan. In this plan there are provisions for conducting a general assessment of students' progress in the basic skills. This was done in a field study in which an adult performance level test was used. This test was given to

gress in a short time. In bilingual education we are practically dealing with the psyche of large groups. The very spirit of Hispanics, and by spirit I mean "el espíritu cultural" which for us is a deeply rooted transcendental feeling for life; a cultural consciousness which is timeless and which knows no physical frontiers, is being reached, touched, moved, awakened - and in the process we are beginning to give back the identity the students have lacked.

The effects are varied, but I suspect that the most important will be achieving a significant freedom for the mind to function, to direct its energies to the business of acquiring knowledge rather than to be withdrawn into self-preocupation. Because of the intricacy of these concepts, it is important to be patient and observant. Educators have to be psychologists, philosophers, and social scientists all at once. They operate mostly in the world of the transitory when dealing with the thought processes of children; transitory because a young mind's ability to function, as Piaget has so painstakingly documented,[3] is subject to and dependent upon previous experience and the influences of the culture in which the child lives.

When working with children, and specifically with children in education, it is important to keep foremost in mind that culture is a crucial element for the educational process. In all serious literature this factor emerges as the permeating and binding force for the individual and the group. As Daniel Bell so lucidly states, "Culture is... the realm of sensibility, of emotion and moral temper, and of intelligence, which seeks to order these feelings."[4]

The Linguistic Dimension

The research and the literature dealing with the nature of

language, language acquisition, language and its relation to the thought processes, language and logic, and other topics is considerable and of varying degrees of scholarship. Indeed the subject is broad enough to engage one's professional life entirely. Perhaps because of the vastness of it, most of us do not have sufficient information to make definitive judgements about linguistic proficiency in relation to bilingualism. The tendency has thus been to speak casually about language dominance, mastery of English, transition into an all English curriculum, and similar topics. Since the linguistic dimension of bilingual education is a crucial factor for the selection of students who will participate in programs, especially under the limiting conditions established by the law, very specific guidelines must be observed, and equally specific criteria used, for placing them in these programs.

Anticipating the difficulties involved, the Congress provided legislative mandates. These mandates are:[5]

1. A mandate to the National Institute of Education to conduct research studies to identify the basic educational needs of children with limited English-speaking ability.

2. A mandate to "(1) undertake studies to determine the basic... language acquisition characteristics of... limited English-speaking ability..." students.

3. A mandate to the "...Commissioner and the Director to provide for periodic consultation with representatives of state and local agencies..." on the nature of needs and, by implication, the nature and quality of English language proficiency.

In spite of the significance of these legislative mandates, there has not been sufficient and qualitative research done in the area of language proficiency. The U. S. Office of Bilingual Education has operated most programs rather timidly and with political overtones and has not imposed quality controls. Very little significant consultation with state and

local agencies has taken place regarding needs and program quality. Also, the National Institute of Education, either did not realize the magnitude of the work which had to be done or ignored the significance of the mandates. Because of these situations, no appreciable work on the issues, especially the identification of students, was done until February, 1977, when NIE finally decided to conduct a Children's English and Services Study. The study included a general survey to "...provide national estimates of children 5-14 years old: (1) who are from non-English backgrounds of limited English-speaking ability; (2) who have limited English-speaking ability who are receiving bilingual and other special services in school; and (3) who are from non-English language backgrounds who are receiving bilingual and other special services in school."[6] A contract for the study was issued in February, 1977, over two and a half years after P.L. 93-380 was approved by Congress, to the consortium of L. Miranda and Associates, Resource Development Institute, Opinion Research Corporation, and Research Triangle Institute. This study has probably been the most comprehensive one done in the United States for identifying linguistic minority children.[7] It also is one of the most inclusive, for the contractors organized a team of researchers and consultants with excellent expertise in all aspects of the study.

The Language Measurement and Assessment Inventories used form the core of the study. These instruments are designed to measure the student's mastery of specific English language skills normally used in public schools. The instruments are based on specific and carefully drafted objectives,[8] and the range of these objectives encompass not only language mastery, but the use of language skills in school related activities. This focus is of extreme importance for Hispanic origin children, especially in the Southwest, where

the question of language dominance is a crucial one. These students are dominant in English, but definitely not dominant to the degree and facility of the native speaker of English. And it is in the domains of school language use that the Hispanic students show marked deficiencies. The results of these English language inadequacies are cumulative deficits in conceptual development. These deficits, along with the low prestige that the Spanish language has in some parts of the United States, are probably responsible for the academic, social, and psychological alienation referred to earlier. Therefore, it is hoped that the results[9] of the study will be seriously used by the U. S. Office of Education, and especially the U. S. Office of Bilingual Education, to achieve some streamlining of programs, and to establish quality controls in the delivery of services to Hispanics in the schools of the nation.

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to present a study of the linguistic capabilities or lack thereof of Hispanics, it is my purpose to underscore the importance of language proficiency and its implications for the success of Hispanics in school. Proficiency is a relative term, and because of this relativity vis à vis the students involved, the messages we get from researchers and scholars such as Peal and Lambert,[10] De Avila,[11] and Carter[12] must be heeded. De Avila and others conducted one study using approximately 1,100 Mexican-American and Anglo American students in which I.Q., school achievement, and other tasks were measured (De Avila, Havassy, Pascual-Leone, 1975). Their purpose was to test and compare developmental levels and achievement using standardized tests with performance tasks. The results of the study indicate that Mexican-American and Anglo American students may be equal in cognitive development but not equal in school achievement. Their general conclusions point to linguistic and

cultural bias in the curricula as some of the factors responsible for the traditional disparities in general achievement between Hispanics and Anglo Americans.

Some Hispanics are very much concerned about malpractices in testing when dealing with the education of Spanish-speaking children. Bernal points out that in an effort to respond to court cases and the increasing demands of bilingual programs, language assessment has assumed an important role in the education of Chicanos. He warns that "...testing brings yet another important set of variables into the [picture]; variables which may be generally classified under bilingualism. ...Hispanics have become victims of test abuse and test misuse because they have not been adequately represented in the samples of students used for test development..."[13]

The linguistic dimension thus continues to be the most important factor bearing upon bilingual programs. As already stated, this dimension is relative and must be handled in a delicate manner. This relativity must be looked at in comparison with standard middle-class English language proficiency as a point of departure. The use of this standard can be defended because it is the type of language used in the nation's schools, and educators use that elusive standard as the criterion for success. With this as the operational framework, we must insist upon legal provisions such as those contained in S. 1753 which clearly state that the students to be served with Title VII, ESEA, funds should "...attain levels of proficiency comparable to others at their appropriate age and grade level."[14] It will be better yet to substitute the word "equal" for "comparable" and thus eliminate any possible negative interpretation of the intent of the law.

Since the question of language proficiency is the central issue, the leadership in bilingual education must insist on specifics for identifying

children for bilingual programs. These specifics must include provisions that will allow two categories of students, now excluded, to participate: (a) students whose mother and dominant tongue is Spanish but who are above the so-called poverty level; and (b) students who are achieving at or above local norms in core content areas taught in English but who wish to retain and expand their Spanish linguistic skills. The first group has a legitimate claim to these programs under Lau vs. Nichols, a claim which assures them that they will continue their intellectual development by using their language as the learning tool; the second group has a general human right to maintain their language and culture in the "pursuit of happiness." Viewing the issue of human rights from the realm of symbolic politics and as a justification of this nation's multicultural makeup, we must pursue this right with a moral purpose, especially from the point of view that this nation is evolving unmistakably into an international defender of all basic human rights.

America's massive technology has created the depersonalization of individuals and of entire groups. The norms of efficiency, constant production, extreme specialization, and compartmentalized living where huge apartment houses act as "filing systems"[15] for people, contribute much to the general malaise and alienation of a large number of people. These social manifestations are quite observable in our society. The labyrinth of existence under these conditions becomes absolutely unmanageable for some groups. For them, and Hispanics are the largest of these groups, the home language and their vastly rich traditional cultures will provide the only personal symbols and bridges to manage the complexity of America's social structure. In reality one can say that it is an investment in the solidarity of the United States as a world power to invest in bilingual programs, not only from the point of view of international prestige, but also in the interest of domestic tranquility.

The Cultural Dimension

Culture is the pervasive element in human life. It gives life quality or takes it away; molds the total behavior of the individual and of the group; makes us interpret reality and cope with it; provides our moral codes; and allows us to create and to destroy. Culture is what allows nations to exist because it provides the cohesive fabric for civilization, for unity, and for the social contract. The force and power of culture is so great that its manifestations can be felt hundreds of years after certain of its established practices are no longer used. Culture dictates the moral education of children even before children are brought under the influence of schools. The societal precepts inculcated in them in childhood determine the kind and the quality of their actions in later life. Hispanics in the United States cannot escape the influence of their centuries old culture nor reject the vitality and aggressiveness of this new one called American culture.

Culture can be divided into two parts - fundamental and monumental - both of which must be attended to by the social institution we know as the schools. The fundamental aspects of culture deal with the elements of daily life: food, shelter, recreation, religion, government, health and the life affirming mores such as the rites of birth, marriage, and death. Hispanics have a very distinctive and active fundamental culture which differs significantly from that of Anglo Americans. If Chicanos in the Southwest have forged an identity for themselves, that identity is based on their fundamental culture, more so than on their Spanish language, although this language is an essential component of that identity. The monumental aspects of culture are wider and more lasting manifestations of the thought and creative genius of a people. Hispanics are heirs to one of the greatest monumental

cultures of Western civilization. The achievements of Hispanics in art, music, literature, architecture, jurisprudence, religion, and philosophy since before Christianity and undiminished until the present, are testimony to our intellectual vitality. These achievements and vitality must be represented in the curriculum which educates our children, regardless of the language to be used. Politically we are Americans, and we reaffirm our loyalty to this reality; culturally we belong to a wider universe, and that universe has shaped our soul, our intellect, our existence. We are destroyed psychologically and intellectually if our cultural dimensions are excluded from the educational process. Because we know the devastating effects of cultural anonymity we must insist that bilingual programs also be multicultural.

Because of the complexity of these issues, it is difficult to use simple, direct, and practical approaches when making decisions about the education of Hispanics within the framework of present legislation; and the general philosophy governing American education is one that calls for directness and practicality.

Within the realm of practicality, the following recommendations are made to the U. S. Office of Education to be used as part of the criteria to determine eligibility of children for bilingual programs.

1. Include Hispanic students, regardless of surname, who are one grade level or lower in academic achievement in standardized tests in the areas of a) English Language Arts, b) Social Studies, c) Science, and d) Mathematics. The decisive and primary determining factor is to be the English Language Arts in its totality.
2. Include any Hispanic student falling within any of the categories which would require a specific response from local schools as outlined in the Lau Remedies.
3. Include any Hispanic student wishing access to bilingual education, regardless of economic background or English language proficiency.

In order to ascertain that the identification of students who need bilingual instruction is bona fide and that the funded programs will deliver quality instruction, the following items should be an integral part of the criteria for funding programs.

1. Title VII student identification procedures should include information on English proficiency for students to be served and comparable achievement information so that Title VII, ESEA, and other programs will be in consonance with Lau compliance.

2. Require better selection of assessment instruments to be used in the program for pre and post testing of students in English language skills. The instruments must, at a minimum, cover objectives such as those used by L. Miranda and Associates, Inc., for their Language and Assessment Inventories.

3. Require provisions for tracking the achievement of students in the program in all the areas of English Language Arts and content areas to ascertain progressive and developmental acquisition of English language proficiency and achievement in the core areas of the curriculum for a minimum of five years. A longitudinal or spiral system which will record and report student progress can serve as an internal mechanism to assure program effectiveness also.

4. Require that measurements for achievement include testing in the home language of the students.

The three recommendations on eligibility are made to make sure that the population for whom the law was written is served. They are also made to include a wider population and thus avoid the stigma that many programs now carry; a stigma which relegates bilingual education to a remedial and compensatory category not acceptable to a large majority of Hispanics. Allowing students who wish to maintain and expand their proficiency in the home language and culture would provide definite advantages. Inclusion of these students will avoid tracking and grouping of those with severe lack of proficiency in English, and at the same time

would provide intellectual challenges for all students, both in English as well as the home language.

The U. S. Office of Education needs to provide the leadership in providing projects with guidelines or criteria for a more efficient selection of valid instruments. Such a list of criteria may include the following:*

1. Validity - the test should measure what it purports to measure and contain information indicating empirical validity.

2. Reliability - the test authors/publishers should provide evidence of acceptable test reliability (around .80 or above).

3. Norms - the test should provide norms for the group with which it deals. It should have statistical descriptions of both the limited English-speaking population and the native English-speaking population.

In bilingual education projects, tests which are to be used to assess linguistic behavior, should possess the following:

1. Test construction and scoring procedures must be consistent with evidence from research on developmental process in language acquisition.

2. The language used in cues and especially in responses required by the test should be consistent with natural patterns of discourse.

3. English language tests must assess control of the grammatical structures of English.

Other test evaluation criteria might include age-grade appropriateness of the instrument and usefulness of an administrator's manual.

The items on program approval will provide information on actual and projected needs for English language services and will not leave local districts to their own devices regarding the delivery of the services. Tracking, recording, and reporting student acquisition of language proficiency

*These items contributed by Dr. Gilberto J. Cuevas, University of Miami.

by age and grade level also assures continuity of services for participating students.

Teachers For the Bilingual Program

As one reads Section 105 of P.L. 93-380 and the rules and regulations for bilingual programs published in the Federal Register of June 11, 1976, three elements emerge which should form the core of these programs: a) language, b) culture, and c) pedagogy. The importance of language and culture have been discussed above with the student in mind. It is time to consider the teacher.

When an individual is granted credentials for the teaching profession, he has undergone at least four years of specific study and training. Most universities have very precise criteria which specify what studies are required before a degree, from any of the colleges or departments, is awarded. In addition, each college sets additional standards for its graduates. The colleges of education have special criteria for educators which they guard with vigor. Both the general requirements and the specific are designed to graduate educated persons. In the case of teachers it is crucial that the term "educated" be applied both to the acquisition of specific knowledge and to the interrelation of knowledge and the ability to apply it when educating children.

Teachers are entrusted by society with the most delicate but powerful human commodity - the minds of students. Since we place in their custody the intellectual development of the nation's future citizens, it is not unreasonable to expect of teachers a good measure of sophistication not only in the area of certain skills, but also of specific knowledge.

In bilingual programs teachers will have to operate with two languages and two cultures, and we must determine whether the criteria of "educated person" will apply equally for both languages and both cultures. In the

case of programs for Hispanics the answer must be yes.

In the area of language, one has to assume that the facility to use the medium orally at various levels of usage should be a prerequisite for teachers. This facility should include technical vocabularies for classroom management and for all subjects taught. But these skills cannot be limited to classroom functions, since the teacher is also a societal model. Oral language facility and proficiency must extend to all social domains as well. They must have skills in reading and writing also. Literacy is of paramount importance because without it, it is impossible for teachers to function in the classroom and teach the skills to students.

Anticipating the requirements that should be formulated for preparing teachers for bilingual education, several state education agencies across the country have drafted bilingual endorsement criteria in this area. In June, 1976, the National Center for Education Statistics published the results of a national survey conducted to determine the state of the art.[16] The Center for Applied Linguistics has also prepared guidelines on the subject.[17] As one reviews these documents it is impressive to see that most states emphasize competence in the non-English language, culture, and history of the students. However, very few states require verification of that competence through objective measurements.

The U. S. Office of Bilingual Education, to my knowledge, has no specific requirements for the national bilingual teacher training program sponsored under Title VII of the Elementary Secondary Education Act. The criteria published in the Federal Register is much too vague.

As one reviews the literature on teacher training for bilingual education, in spite of a decisive trend to include language and culture in certification requirements, one concept emerges - vagueness. Most of the

requirements for certification or endorsement in the field refer to personal qualities, attitudes, skills, experience, knowledge, and the like. When dealing with language proficiency the criteria usually indicates literacy skills, the ability to communicate, adequate control of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, and statements about the culture such as awareness, ability to assist, recognition of cultural patterns, understanding and appreciation, and other declarations which fail to give precise indicators for mastery of important content areas such as history, civilization, fine arts, literature, mathematics, science, or the social sciences.

After long experience with these issues, this writer conducted a survey in New Mexico in which 136 teachers and aides in bilingual programs, many of whom had university training, were given a simple third grade reading and writing test in Spanish. About ten percent of them were able to function at this level on the test. None could handle the fourth grade level. This situation is not unique to New Mexico. In discussions with teachers and administrators from several states, the situation across the nation appears to be the same.

Teachers and aides should not be victimized by any system or program. They do the basic work, and somehow if students fail, they take the blame and the criticism. But teachers go to the universities to get credentials. It is there that the quality of preparation should provide for competence and performance. But in the universities we find that a great number of professors also lack the skills and content knowledge. Many university professors, like teachers, are victims of the very system they are trying to correct. But at this level one does not have to worry about certification, endorsement, nor direct supervision. The result has been a terrible disregard for academic standards when dealing with the Spanish language and most

aspects of the culture.

In the area of pedagogy, a different picture emerges. All possible aspects of methodology are dealt with, and teachers' credentials seem to be replete with courses dealing with bilingual children and how to teach them.

The present situation must change. The national law and all bilingual education legislation is directed at the educational needs of students. These needs will never be satisfied if teachers do not have a theoretical base, the language skills, and the basic knowledge about the fundamental and monumental cultures which an educated person must have. Common vernaculars and the folk aspects of culture are not enough. How can the present situation be changed? Money talks; so let the millions of federal dollars going to institutions of higher education for the preparation of bilingual education teachers do the persuading for us; but we must insist that the university personnel who are to educate the teachers have themselves a measure of competence and scholarship in the language - insist that they read and write the Spanish language using some standard of selectivity and excellence. And in the matter of culture, let the federal dollars buy significant scope. We cannot continue to pay for the mundane, the commonplace, and the stereotype. Ours is a vast and rich heritage. We must not prostitute this heritage for a few jobs. Universities must incorporate into the training programs the resources available in the departments of history, fine arts, anthropology, language and literature, and any department which can contribute to the preparation of teachers. Bilingual teacher training programs were not created exclusively for colleges of education. It will take special effort from the U. S. Office of Bilingual Education, through better and specific funding criteria, to reverse the present trend of loading teacher training with pedagogy or surface cultural content. It will also require closer and better monitoring of the programs by the funding agency, including independent

program audits controlled by forces outside the universities.

We do not hesitate to test children - we apply severe criteria to public school programs - we are forever putting pressure on publishers for better teaching materials; but the universities seem to be sacrosanct. It seems that we operate on the premise that the university can do no wrong, yet when we find that teachers with advanced degrees in bilingual education cannot read or write the second language at an acceptable level or that cultural foundations are weak, we do not search for the source of these deficiencies to apply corrective measures. Since funds for teacher training will continue to be provided, we must insist that the terminal product be examined against actual needs and against some measure of excellence. It is time that we request specific action from the U. S. Commissioner of Education to require a truly academic base for bilingual teacher training programs. This base should not only be on paper; it should be translated from proposals to actual programs.

Specific on-site monitoring and independent evaluations, independent of university control, should be required before federal grants are made. Some states have drafted certification guidelines and criteria for bilingual teacher training. The Commissioner should require all Title VII training programs to give priority to these guidelines or criteria, and where those requirements are weak, there should be national criteria to provide the substance. The latter should contain, at a minimum, the following elements:

1. Provide teachers with demonstrable competence in understanding, speaking, reading and writing of the non-English language at a level expected of an educated person.

2. Provide for the study of the history and civilization of the people whose culture is to be learned or taught. This to be in addition to current sociological issues, not as substitutions.

3. Provide for the study of the fine arts of the culture involved.

4. Provide for the study of at least the highlights of the literatures of the culture involved.

5. Provide for the study of specific language pedagogy, including the nature of language as used in the thought processes.

6. Make provisions for teaching the academic content in the language and culture in Spanish and thus give an opportunity to teachers to expand their command and use of the language and of reading and writing skills.

7. Include training in socio and psycholinguistic factors impinging upon the learning process.

8. Provide more and better training in the teaching of English, both as a second and first language, and how to teach core content (social studies, mathematics, science, health, consumer education) bilingually to ascertain satisfactory progress for bilingual children in the standard curriculum.

Serious treatment of these eight areas are crucial to the success of bilingual programs in the classroom. The first four are being ignored in many training programs, and if acknowledged, they are approached mostly as contemporary sociological issues.

As has already been stated, language and culture are central and decisive components in any bilingual education undertaking. It does not matter whether the purpose of the programs be for transition into an all English curriculum or language and culture maintenance. Teachers must first have the language skills they are trying to teach. In culture, lack of academic background negatively affects the process of teaching, and, it leaves the teacher vulnerable and mute when intellectual depth for interpreting the various facets of culture is expected of him. If teachers are to be societal models for children, we must strive to give them the best preparation possible.

Hispanic values are not usually represented positively in textbooks. On the contrary, there is a history of misrepresentation and outright slander

about many aspects of our culture in several countries. Powell has researched what he calls "Hispanophobia" extensively and discovered that:

> "Jaundiced views of the Hispanic world are taught very early in our schools, and they are thoroughly inculcated by the time we enter college and university. If our students know any history at all when they reach college (increasingly a moot point), it is apt to be a naïve, parochial version of United States development, in which Spain is honored by brief glimpses of Columbus, Balboa, Magellan, Cortés, Pizarro, De Soto, Coronado, [emphasis on the fact that he fell from his horse], interjected with Menéndez de Avilés butchering those virtuous Huguenots in Florida."[18]

How are we to expect a positive self-concept from anyone whose cultural roots have been pruned to a stub? It is very rare to find teachers in bilingual programs whose training includes close and objective study of our history and civilization. Many approach the development of the self-concept, and this has been a much touted objective of bilingual education, exclusively from the psychological point of departure of behavior modification. The psychological techniques do work for practical human relations situations, but the true self-concept is based on lasting, cherished, and deep cultural values. Without serious study of our history and culture, teachers in bilingual programs will be trite and superficial when dealing with serious content.

The original intentions of the U. S. Office of Education in bilingual programs was to provide initial funding for model projects. These intentions were sound because the available funds for this type of education innovation have been limited. All innovations are experiments, and as such, they must go through experimental processes. Up to now, we have had success and failure. It is time for an appraisal of both and for new directions.

Whether bilingual education programs continue to be model projects for demonstrating viable alternatives for the education of Hispanics or general

service programs to correct deficits in the education of our children, the selection for participation in the programs and the training of teachers for them are serious responsibilities. The selection of students for participation is not a difficult problem; the training of teachers is difficult indeed.

The leadership in bilingual education must have a voice in charting courses of action for the future, and the future begins today. Let us bring together the vast talent of the Hispanic community and provide this nation, the fourth largest Spanish-speaking nation in the world, with a decisive framework for the education of our children.

BLANK PAGE
DO NOT FILM

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Vygotsky, Lev, Thought and Language, M.I.T. Press, 1974

2. United States Commission on Civil Rights Reports: "The Unfinished Education," October, 1971, "The Excluded Students," U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1972

3. Flavell, J. H., The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget, D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York

4. Bell, Daniel, The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism, Basic Books, N.Y., 1976

5. P.L. 93-380, August, 1974

6. Unpublished document issued by L. Miranda and Associates to the National Panel of Reviewers, CESS, August, 1977

7. De Avila and Havassy: Also refer to "The Testing of Minority Children - a Neo-Piagetian Approach" in "Today's Education," Journal of the National Education Association, November-December, 1974, pp. 72-75.

8. Language Measurement and Assessment Inventories, L. Miranda and Associates, Inc., Washington, D. C., Also see document referred to in No. 6 above and Appendix A.

9. In oral communication with Lourdes Miranda King of L. Miranda and Associates, it was learned that the final report of the study will be delivered to NIE by November, 1978.

10. Peal, Elizabeth and Lambert, Wallace E. "The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence, Psychological Monographs: General and Applied," Vol. 76, No. 27, 1962

11. De Avila, Edward A. and Duncan, Sharon E., "A Few Thoughts About Language Assessment, The Lau Decision Reconsidered," Bilingual Education Paper Series, National Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles

12. Carter, Thomas P., Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1970

13. Bernal, Ernest M. "Adapting Assessment Procedures to Specific Population Characteristics: The Chicano Child," paper delivered in Albuquerque, New Mexico, February, 1977

14. Senate Bill 1753, Extension to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, June, 1978.

15. Hall, Edward T., The Hidden Dimension, Doubleday and Co., 1969

16. Waggoner, Dorothy, "State Certification Requirements for Teachers for Bilingual Education Programs," U. S. Government Printing Office, 1977

17. "Guidelines for the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of Bilingual-Bicultural Education," Center for Applied Linguistics, 1974

18. Powell, Phillip W., Tree of Hate, Basic Books, Inc., New York

APPENDIX A

Language Measurement and Assessment Inventories

Each test is criterion-referenced, reflecting the language skills needed by a student to function in an English-speaking classroom at the appropriate age level. Each LM&AI age form is able to identify children whose ability to read, write, speak, and understand oral English are below the requisite skill level. These children are classified as Limited English-Speaking Ability (LESA); thus, through a national survey, including LM&AI testing, it is possible to estimate the number of LESA children in various states. Once children are identified as LESA, it then becomes possible to gather data on the school services needed, and services received, by children of limited English language proficiency.

The ten age forms, five through fourteen, were developed cooperatively by subject matter and test specialists (teachers, curriculum specialists, school psychologists, linguists, and psychometricians). A national group representing State Education Agencies provided guidance on the types of content to be used and, during the development of the LM&AI, monitored and advised on its progress. "Oral" and "written" sections were developed, each with several subsections (e.g., reading comprehension and idiomatic expressions). The test for five year olds differs in that it does not require reading.

Three versions of the tests were successively developed and field tested nationally among 1700 students. The fourth and final version, the LM&AI, has been used to classify LESA children in a national probability sample. Rigorous statistical and content analyses were performed in arriving at the final instruments. Reliability and validity coefficients

are quite high and have demonstrated that consistent and accurate measurement of English language proficiency, for the purposes stated, is possible.

It is anticipated that the ten age forms of the Language Measurement and Assessment Inventories will be available for further use following completion of the Children's English and Services Study.

L. Miranda and Asscciates, Inc. will be happy to furnish additional information upon contact.